**Appendix 1**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Date Raised** | **Owner** | **Gross** | **Current** | **Residual** | **Comments** | **Controls** |
| **Title** | **Risk description** | **Opp/ threat** | **Cause** | **Consequence** | **I** | **P** | **I** | **P** | **I** | **P** | **Control description** | **Due date** | **Status** | **Progress %** | **Action Owner** |
|  |
| Costs of demolition are higher than anticipated | Detailed quotes are significantly higher than previous indications when they are received. | Threat | Various including presence of asbestos and competition for demolition contractors  | Higher costs for Council | 23/8/17 | Stephen Clarke | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 |  | Early engagement with Contractors and carrying out of asbestos survey to reduce provisional sums in bids. | 16/10/17 | Completed | 100 | Martin Shaw |
| Valuation mechanism may produce site value below the initial appraisal. | By adopting a mechanism to capture potential uplift in site value, final receipt may be lower than initial valuation. | Threat | Unexpected rise in development costs or drop in scheme value. | Less money available to pay Council for land  | 23/8/17 | Stephen Clarke | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 1 |  | Consider structuring deal that transfers more of this risk to the housing company. | 16/10/17 | Ongoing | 50 | Alan Wylde |